

CONNECTICUT OYSTERS.

A NOTABLE AND IMPORTANT LEGISLATIVE HEARING.

At the State Capitol—The Connecticut Oyster Growers' Association Represented by a Large Delegation—Testimony of Prominent Men.

An important hearing upon the oyster interests of the state took place before the fisheries committee of the general assembly Wednesday afternoon. The Connecticut Oyster Growers' Association was represented by a large delegation of prominent oyster growers from nearly every shore town from New Haven to Greenwich, and the Oystermen's Protective Association was represented by its legislative committee. Both the associations and the whole oyster interest of the state was united in opposing the bill consolidating the shell fish commission with the fisheries commission and game commission; also in asking the general assembly to direct the shell fish commission to create an oyster police.

The hearing was conducted on the part of the oyster interest by Henry C. Rowe, president of the Connecticut Oyster Growers' Association, who is called W. A. Lewis, the representative of the Oystermen's Protective Association, to express the wishes of the natural growers, so-called.

Mr. Lewis stated that in the opinion of the association he represented it would be injurious and inconvenient to the oyster interest of the state that such a bill as the one consolidating the three commissions should be passed. He said: "The oystermen and members of our association are unanimously opposed to the passage of this bill. With reference to the oyster police bill I would say that we favor its passage, and think it would be a benefit to the planters. Moreover they think that the present shell fish commission is right and proper, and do not think it right that they should consolidate fish, game, etc. in it."

Mr. Collins—"Now with reference to that bill touching oyster police—do you think it is right, do you?" Mr. Lewis—"I think it would be beneficial to the planters to have a system of police patrol."

Mr. Collins—"Now you know, Mr. Rowe, a constable can only act in his own town, and a sheriff cannot act outside of his own county without being deputized." Mr. Rowe showed by reference to the statutes, revision of 1888, section 2,400, page 528, that Mr. Collins was entirely mistaken in this statement.

Senator Chapman—"Mr. Lewis, would the oystermen have any objection to the shell fish commission being changed in name to the 'Oyster Commission'?" Mr. Lewis replied: "I don't think I could answer that without consulting with my association."

Mr. Collins questioned the right of Mr. Lewis to represent the Oystermen's Protective Association without a written certificate that he was so authorized. Mr. Rowe said—"I would like to say in behalf of the State Oyster Growers' Association that a committee of thirteen representative men was appointed to present the views of the association. Captain Lewis and Captain McGuinness were duly appointed to represent their association, and it is quite out of place for Mr. Collins to question their appointment. Their statement that they represent their association is quite sufficient before the legislative committee."

Mr. Rowe then called on Captain McGuinness of Stamford who said—"It is in my opinion the unanimous wish of my association that this consolidation bill be rejected. I think the police bill should be passed. We think that something like that is necessary and would be very beneficial to the oyster industry of the state. I have inquired, 'Why not have one gentleman from each association represent that association?' Mr. Rowe replied, stating to the committee—"It is rank impertinence for Mr. Hall to say who shall represent these associations. Every oyster grower in the state has far more right to appear before this committee than our friends Messrs. Collins and Hall, because the oyster growers know something about the matter."

Henry C. Rowe, president of the Connecticut Oyster Growers' Association, said: "I am directed by our association committee to state their views and give our reasons for them:

Twenty-five years ago a great tract of barren sand lay between Connecticut and New York, covered by from twenty to sixty feet of water. It was apparently to man; supposed so worthless that no one took the trouble to find out whether Connecticut or New York owned it.

Oyster cultivation was confined to the land-locked and protected waters. Some venturesome men undertook to raise oysters in this deep water, one, two and three miles from land. They were called "fool" for asking their money and labor in such a way. People said, "You cannot raise oysters there; if you raise oysters there the starfish will destroy them; if you raise them there you cannot protect them; you will get no titles to the ground; New York owns to our high water mark and it is of no use to attempt any such enterprise; it is a case of a fool and his money soon parted."

I was the earliest fool of them all in that the records show that I took the first designation in the deep water outside of the reefs and headlands. There were contests of titles. There was strong prejudice in the public mind against the undertaking. The feeling was strong that oyster grounds, whether artificial or natural, should be common. Even a learned judge decided in a prosecution for theft that there was no intent to do wrong, and acquitted the prisoner because he stole the oysters in daylight, although there was no one within half a mile at the time.

When we began to meet with success there were jealousies and envious and cries of "monopoly."

The starfish and storms destroyed ten and twenty thousands of dollars worth of our property. The legislature at one time partook of the public prejudice, and it was very difficult to get legislation to protect what we had accomplished. Some times people tried to legislate for oyster interests who did not know the rudiments of the industry. But despite all these difficulties the oyster industry became a great fact.

Before the shell-fish commission was created, in 1881, the industry grew faster, was more successful and more profitable in proportion to the outlay, than it ever has been at any period since.

The commission said in their first report of shell fish commission: The number dependent upon the industry does not probably fall short of thirty-five hundred men.

Our genial friend has challenged a comparison, so you will pardon the egotism when we say that we created an industry which has furnished food for millions of persons and work for thousands.

We have shipped oysters not only to the eastern states, but to the middle states and to the Pacific coast, Oregon and Washington territory; to England, Germany and the Bermudas.

We have paid millions of dollars in wages to men and women in the business; to ship builders to build the seventy steamers Mr. Collins alluded to; for building wharves, shops, dredges and a hundred things which would have cost us heard mentioned, which we use in our business. We have paid great sums of money in wages to pilots, engineers, shoemakers, deck hands, oyster operators—both men and women—carpenters, builders, masons, blacksmiths, boiler makers, engine builders, mechanics and artisans, and professional men of every sort. We have even paid considerable sums to bacteriologists to examine oysters the past fall, to show the absurdity of that typhoid fever craze—long since exploded—which Mr. Hall brought up as a reason for his bill yesterday.

I will not weary you with a fraction of the ways by which the industry has added to the wealth and prosperity of the state.

Our friends alluded to the railroad fares of sportsmen and challenged a comparison. Why, we should say in round numbers that the mere freight and expressage shipped in one single day by the oyster dealers in this state probably amounts to more than all the sportsmen's fares in a year.

I will not dwell longer on these general advantages to the state accruing from the industry which we have created.

Among the minor and more particular items, I may mention that we have paid directly into the state treasury for this once worthless ground \$60,707.53, and since we have bought it we have paid in a direct state tax the sum of \$80,555.24.

This, as Mr. Merwin remarked early in the hearing, is entirely independent of our regular town, city, borough, school and other taxes, which we pay upon our wharves, shops, steamers and all our investments in our business. We have there paid into the state treasury directly the sum of \$141,262.76 for the privilege of creating a great industry, while at the same time the state has been paying out great sums for the maintenance of the fish commission, and something—I do not know how much—for the protection of the game interests of the state.

It has been producing fish for the sportsman to catch, at its own expense, while we have been paying the state for the privilege of raising oysters, and paying it well. I am not criticizing the policy of the state in so doing. I would not at all intimate that it is not good policy. In fact I don't want to express an opinion about any subject which I know little about.

I have been present in a waiting capacity in hearings on finny fish matters for twenty years, much longer than our genial friends have been present at oyster hearings; but I do not know any more about legislation about finny fish than they do about legislation on shell-fish; consequently I have no suggestion to offer as to legislation about finny fish.

The present shell-fish commission, all are agreed, is an efficient, economical and praiseworthy body of state officials. We want the committee to distinctly understand that the great outlay which was made for the shell-fish commission previous to 1890 was not at all way charged to the oyster growers; moreover it was finally upon the effort principally of myself, that the extravagant and luxurious expenditure of the old commission—not the present men—was cut short.

Their appropriation was reduced by my effort in 1889 from \$13,500 a year to \$4,200, a saving to the state of over \$9,000 a year, which has since been applied to something over \$50,000. The oyster growers never asked for the shell fish commission to be created. It was instituted by the state for the purpose of diverting the proceeds of the sales of ground from the shore towns to the treasury of the state; and later for the purpose of laying and collecting a tax upon the grounds.

The present shell fish commission is done by the present efficient board for the small sum of five hundred dollars a year, covering pay and expenses.

As I before remarked, the oyster industry was more prosperous before the institution of the commission than it ever was after its creation.

Now I have laid before you some of the general considerations that bear upon this bill; but more especially we presume it is the intention of this committee, of the legislature and of the state of Connecticut, to lay no obstacles, annoyances or hindrances in the way of the oyster industry.

One of the duties of the clerk of shell-fisheries is to make assessments on all oyster grounds throughout the jurisdiction of the state.

The clerk of shell fisheries has to make an assessment on all these districts, and is composed of the next session; but this bill of our genial friends would materialize—which I have very little fear will occur—and one of them is appointed commissioner of game, another is appointed commissioner of finny fish, and the third—whoever he may—is appointed commissioner of shell-fish, how would that commission be constituted? It would be a board of relief, until they had spent years in studying the subject of these grounds?

There is much experimental legislation enacted under this gilded dome—in fact a vast deal of it—and by recent efforts of new business I judge you will have plenty of it during the next few months. Much of it is rejected, and much more repeated the next session; but this bill of our genial friends has not even the merit of being experimental. The combination of the fish and shell fish commissions was once tried, and was a shining and conspicuous failure. Now it is a part of this bill that this office should be in Hartford, and

it undoubtedly is a necessary part of the bill if there were to be any such bill at all.

The removal of this office to Hartford would entail a great loss of time, annoyance and expense to the oyster interest of this state. I have procured information from the clerk of shell-fisheries, giving some idea of the amount of such trouble and expense as it would entail upon the oyster industry.

He estimates the visits upon business to the clerk and commission at 1800 in a year. If the office was removed to Hartford that would entail a loss in time and expense to the oyster growers, engineers and others of about seven dollars per visit, or an aggregate of 12,600 a year.

An oyster police should have its headquarters on the coast and not at Hartford, unless they will salt the Connecticut river so that we can raise oysters in it.

We have shown that we have paid into the state treasury \$141,262.76; we have asked only for the expenditure by the state of the pay of inspectors mud dumping, \$2,565.95. This is a ridiculously small outlay in twenty years, while finny fish of the state have been propagated at an expense of perhaps \$100,000 for the fishermen of the state and sportsmen of the state to catch them.

Taxation should procure protection by law. Our property is far less protected than any other in the state. The ground is from one to four miles from land. It is subject to inroads of New York vessels; probably hundreds of thousands of dollars worth are stolen out of the state yearly. We employ private police, but we need to have more with the authority of the state, to act as sheriffs and constables, and we believe we deserve the assistance of the state in maintaining such police.

If the Natural Growers may ask that all that they pay into the state treasury shall be devoted to objects which they propose, why should not we have devoted to such an object as we propose one-half of our taxes, especially when we are at present credited on the books of the state more than \$140,000?

One might say that the state has spent much on the shell fish commission; but any one who is thoroughly informed may well answer that "The oyster growers are in no way responsible for that expense; never asked for the commission, but protested against it."

What we now say is that if there is to be any commission, leave it just as it is; because the men who are upon it are able, efficient, business-like and economical—good for us and good for the state.

We do not need to put ourselves in the position of asking favors, for we feel sure that the committee will see that it is for the interest of the state to report against a bill which will hamper and embarrass the oyster industry, and to report a bill which will protect and foster it.

Mr. Rowe next called on Mr. George C. Waldo, chairman of the shell-fish commission, to express his views. He stated: "As Mr. Rowe has said, am here at the request of the Oyster Growers' Association and not on my own account. I simply come here to, so far as I can, back up their statement that the oyster industry represented by a line of holdings from Greenwich to Branford, some seventy thousand acres—into which in the neighborhood of from three to five millions have been put, with sixty or seventy steamers employing about four thousand persons, is totally opposed to this move to consolidate the commissions, so far as they have expressed themselves. I wish to state that representative men, representing nine-tenths of the tax-paying power of the state and nine-tenths of the acreage, have unanimously voted against the consolidation bill, and this committee of thirteen oyster growers were instructed to express their views."

So far as that goes I think it represents nine-tenths of the oyster growers of the state; the other tenth could have been gotten if the oyster growers had had time to look them up. Therefore it is evident that the oyster industry is opposed to this consolidation bill. I make that statement, but I appear, as I said before, to endorse the declaration of the Oyster Growers' Association. Mr. Hall has asked why one man could not act upon questions that arise as well as three? I don't believe that any man who has been on that commission would want to accept that position with that responsibility. There certainly is no board of relief composed of a single person in Connecticut.

With reference to the principle of "better police" Mr. Waldo—"I am. The principle is not a new one; it has been thought of for a long time. The oyster growers farms lie out a mile and a half to two miles from the shore; they cannot watch them at a time when it is handy for some one to come across and steal one, two or five thousand bushels, and carry the oysters away under cover of night or fog."

Mr. Rowe: "Are you and the commission in favor of the principle of 'better police'?" Mr. Waldo—"I am. The principle is not a new one; it has been thought of for a long time. The oyster growers farms lie out a mile and a half to two miles from the shore; they cannot watch them at a time when it is handy for some one to come across and steal one, two or five thousand bushels, and carry the oysters away under cover of night or fog."

Mr. Rowe: "In your opinion the oyster police ought to be located in Hartford or at New Haven?" Mr. Waldo: "My opinion is that if there is any change the office should go to Bridgeport. It never should go one foot inland. I am not advocating the removal to Bridgeport, but I say if it is to be moved it should be, in my opinion, to Bridgeport."

Mr. Collins took exception to the shell-fish commissioner appearing before the committee and criticized his doing so. Mr. Rowe said that the commissioners appeared at his request, as he knew that some of the committee would like to receive some information from them. Senator Chapman stated: "On behalf of the committee I would say I am very glad to have Mr. Waldo here."

Mr. Rowe next called on Mr. E. Wood Smith of New Haven, who said: "I am a member of the Oyster Growers' Association, representing men who have brought the industry to its present condition. I am opposed to this consolidation bill. We think we know what we want to continue the business properly."

With reference to the oyster police I have felt that we have been paying a good deal of money, and that it is necessary that something should be done to protect our interests.

I endorse the statements and reasons given by Mr. Rowe in behalf of the committee."

Mr. Henry P. Stagg of Stratford then stated as follows: "I am an officer of the State Oyster Growers' Association, and also manager of the Stratford Oyster company. In my opinion it would be injurious to the oyster interests to have such a bill passed, consolidating these commissions. We think we ought to have police protection. I endorse what has been said by Mr. Rowe and Mr. Smith."

Captain William F. Stevens of Rowayton was next called by Mr. Rowe, and stated: "I am entirely opposed to the consolidation of these commissions. I consider the sentiment among the oyster growers is unanimous, without a single exception, against the consolidation bill. I think the oyster industry needs police protection. I endorse all that has been said by Mr. Rowe and the other members of our committee." Senator Chapman: "As I understand it, this oyster industry has been created from nothing—a barren waste of mud and sand?" Captain Stevens: "Yes, you are one of the first to plant ash in the deep water of Norwalk."

Mr. Dumond P. Merwin of Milford stated: "It is the unanimous wish and opinion of the association that this consolidation bill should be rejected, and that police protection should be afforded by the state. I endorse the views of my colleagues who have spoken." Senator Chapman: "Do you consider that your oyster beds are very much exposed to the depredations of the oyster thieves?" Mr. Merwin: "They would be exposed to our private watchmen which we employ." Senator Chapman: "You consider the opportunities for ill-disposed persons to come upon the grounds and take up a large quantity of oysters are very numerous?" Mr. Merwin: "Yes, sir."

Mr. Howe: "Is it still the intention of the oyster growers to continue a sufficient private watchmen to aid and supplement the state police?" Mr. Merwin: "I do not understand it. Senator Chapman: "These oysters which you raise are raised at no expense to the state are they not?" Mr. Merwin: "That is correct." Mr. Merwin further said: "The fact that we pay large amounts to private watchmen shows the need of police protection."

Mr. Rowe called upon Mr. Albert H. Hoyt of South Norwalk, who said: "I am a member of the legislative committee of the Oyster Growers' Association, and vice-president of the association. The oyster growers are unanimously opposed to this bill for consolidating the three commissions. Oyster police are needed for the protection of the industry. I endorse heartily the statements which have been made by my colleagues."

Mr. A. H. Lewis of Bridgeport stated: "I endorse the views expressed by the other oyster growers and other members of the committee. We are heartily in favor of the movement the oyster growers have taken—in favor of police bill, and against the consolidation of the commissions."

Mr. Rowe: "The oyster growers have never asked for anything excepting for the inspectors of mud dumping, amounting to about \$4,000. We believe now that if there is to be any commission it ought to remain as it is. The extravagant management of the old shell fish commission is in no way chargeable to the oyster growers. The commission was created against our wishes, and the appointment of the men was made without our approval, and resulted badly."

Mr. C. D. Parmelee of New Haven said: "I heartily endorse what Mr. Rowe and the other members of the committee have said. It is my opinion that we need police protection with the authority of the state."

Mr. D. C. Sanford of New Haven stated: "I have acted as field engineer for the shell fish commission for fourteen years. I think I know every oyster-terran in the state. I believe that the unanimous opinion of the oyster growers and oystermen is that this consolidation should fail. It is a necessary and desirable thing that the state should lend its authority and aid in enforcing these grounds. I endorse all the opinions expressed by the oyster growers."

Mr. Marshall B. Morris of Bridgeport was next called by Mr. Rowe. He stated: "I am opposed to the passage of the consolidation bill, and endorse the reasons set forth by my colleagues. I am in favor of police protection. I think it would be well to have all the protection we can get."

Mr. Christian Swartz, a member of the shell fish commission stated: "Living in South Norwalk, where I have resided for twenty-seven years, I have become more or less conversant with the oyster industry." Mr. Swartz said that he did not think it would be for the interest of the state or oyster growers to change the organization of the shell fish commission, and that he thought state oyster police were much needed and would be very helpful to the industry, and that the oyster growers were deserving of this assistance.

Senator Chapman: "Is it a fact that the revenue brought into a community from the sale of 100 bushels of oysters is more valuable than several hundred dollars worth of manufactured articles?" Mr. Swartz: "Yes; it undoubtedly is."

Representative Charles W. Lounsbury of Darien, who is thoroughly conversant with the oyster industry, stated to the committee that it would be a great injury to the oyster industry and a very large loss of revenue to mix up the shell fish commission with the finny fish and game. He thought it would be very unwise legislation, and addressed the committee at length, giving his reasons. He also strongly advocated the creation of an oyster police, and gave conclusive reasons why the oyster growers were entitled to this consideration on the part of the state.

Representative H. G. Newton of New Haven stated that in his opinion it would be a great inconvenience and disadvantage to the oyster growers, to have the shell fish commission united with the other commissions, and thought that it would be impossible to unite them to the advantage of any of them. He also advocated the creation of an oyster police, and was of the opinion that the oyster growers deserved such recognition on the part of the state.

Wedded In A Vault.

[From the Kansas City Times.]

A marriage in the inkiness of a vault is something decidedly unique, but that is the sort of a wedding that occurred in the court house yesterday morning.

About 11 o'clock a fine-looking young man and two decidedly good-looking

Paskola

A Flesh Forming Food, (Artificially Digested.)

For pale, thin people. The tired and weary feeling which accompanies all WASTING diseases will be relieved at once, the wasting will be arrested and new healthy tissue will be formed so that they will become plump and strong. An increase in weight will be noticed at once. It is stimulating although it contains no alcohol. It is assimilated without digestive effort. PASKOLA supercedes Cod Liver Oil, but has not its repulsive taste. You can buy it at any drug store. Send your name to The Pre-Digested Food Co., 30 Reade st., New York, and get their interesting pamphlet.

Charles S. Leete & Co., 30 Reade st. New Haven.

and stylishly dressed young women entered the recorder of deeds office and asked for a marriage license, and one was issued to William Dray and Viola Roderick. They said that the marriage was to be a surprise, and requested that nothing be said about the granting of the license. Then they consulted together and asked if they could be married there. Recorder Quail hastened to the telephone and called up Justice E. H. B. and Justice arrived word had passed around that a wedding was to occur and the room was filled with invited guests. The groom did not relish this, neither did the bride, neither did the bride's sister, who was of the party. The door to the large vault where the records are kept stood invitingly open, and the groom said: "Let's enter in here," and the bride party entered the vault. It was brightly lighted and filled with the dull odor of musty records. The bride glanced about, frightened a bit, but then looked at the room and smiled sweetly. The groom, evidently a brave man, was not as nervous as the justice, who fumbled to get from his pocket a paper upon which he had written the words of a simple marriage ceremony. The door was shut softly behind the party and the wedding was solemnized in quietness.

The justice was getting along fairly well, and had just reached that part in the ceremony where he asked the couple to join hands, when something happened. One of the clerks had slipped to the switchboard and turned off the lights in the vault. Everything was as black as darkest midnight. The bride and groom could not see each other. The justice could not see them. It was no time to stop or falter, however.

"Find her hand," said the justice, and the hands came together though they had met in the dark before.

"By the authority vested in me by the law, I pronounce you man and wife."

It was over, and Mr. and Mrs. Dray came out into the light of day as happy as though they had been married in the noonday glare of a thousand suns.

Financial.

The Stock Market Yesterday Was Weak and Lower.

New York, Feb. 28.—Fears of gold shipments, liquidations for London and increased pressure from bearish sources lead to a weak and lower market for stocks to-day. Operators for lower prices made considerable of the high rates for sterling exchange and were predicting gold exports at an early date. They were not very definite in their statements, however, nor could they explain how shipments could be made at a profit now that the Bank of England is paying less for gold and continental exchange is considerably higher than when the recent export movement was in progress. Well known drawers of exchange, it should be added, are not disturbed by the talk of exports and assert that bills will be forthcoming when required by remitters. London was quite a seller of international stocks. The foreigners do not appear to be able to recover from the shock given by the passing of the Canadian Pacific dividend. To-day's sales for European account are placed at twenty to twenty-five thousand shares.

Conspicuously weak stocks were New York Central, the Grangers, Baltimore and Ohio, Chicago Gas, Lake Shore, Louisville and Nashville, Manhattan, Jersey Central, and Western Union. New York Central fell 1 1/2 to 95 1/2 on unconfirmed rumors of an issue of new stock. Northwest sold down 1 to 87 1/2. Burlington and Quincy to 89 1/2. Rock Island to 61 1/2 and St. Paul to 64 1/2. These stocks were influenced by the rumors of a reduction in the St. Paul dividend. The directors do not meet until March 14 next, and nothing official can be obtained about the matter until then.

Baltimore and Ohio declined 3/4 to 65 1/2, but later rallied on semi-official statements that the March interest was in bank and that the company had not borrowed a dollar for this or any other purpose. Chicago Gas sold up to 72 1/2 on the election of R. T. Lincoln to the presidency of one of the subsidiary companies, and then broke to 70 1/2 on sales for both accounts. Louisville and Nashville opened 1 per cent. lower at 50, dropped to 48 1/2, and rallied to 49. London was a liberal seller. Lake Shore on moderate sales declined 1/4 to 123 1/2. Jersey Central advanced to 84 1/2, then fell to 83 1/2, and recovered to 84 1/2. The annual report now due will show, it is said, only 4 per cent. earned on the stock. Sugar was quite strong at one time, and moved up to 92 1/2, but in the last hour it suddenly ran off to 91 1/2.

After delivery hour the general list rallied 1/4 to 3/4 per cent. New York Central and Jersey Central leading, but when Sugar dropped a point or so the entire list weakened in sympathy.

Speculation left off weak. Net changes show losses of 1/4 to 3/4 per cent. Tobacco and New England gained 3/4 per cent. each. The first named was

strengthened at one time by the absorption of the Consolidated Cigarette and International Machine companies. The bond market was weak. Sales were \$778,000.

Following are the closing prices reported by Prince & Whitley, bankers and brokers, 46 Broadway, New York, and 15 Center street, New Haven:

	Bid.	Asked.
American Tobacco Co.	90 1/2	91 1/2
American Cotton Oil Co.	100	101
American Oil Co.	60	61
American Refining Co.	10 1/2	10 3/4
Amalgamated Copper Co.	85 1/2	86 1/2
Amalgamated Zinc Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Lead Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Nickel Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Silver Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Tin Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Iron Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Steel Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Glass Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Paper Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Textile Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Lumber Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Brick Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Cement Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Coal Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Oil Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Gas Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Water Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Electric Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Telephone Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Railroad Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Ship Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Marine Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Fishing Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Hunting Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Trapping Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Breeding Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Raising Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Feeding Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Dressing Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Tanning Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Dyeing Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Printing Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Bookbinding Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Stationery Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Paper Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Textile Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Lumber Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Brick Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Cement Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Coal Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Oil Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Gas Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Water Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Electric Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Telephone Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Railroad Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Ship Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Marine Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Fishing Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Hunting Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Trapping Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Breeding Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Raising Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Feeding Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Dressing Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Tanning Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Dyeing Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Printing Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Bookbinding Co.	40 1/2	41 1/2
Amalgamated Stationery Co.	40 1/2	4